



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority	<b>County</b>	San Joaquin
<b>Project Title</b>	San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Model	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 249,270.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 249,270.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal develops a modeling tool based on the Central Valley Hydrologic Model and its associated data sets to test groundwater recharge scenarios and their conformance to the adopted Basin Management Objectives for proposed banking operations.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>35</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The Groundwater Banking Authority (GBA) GWMP was adopted by the GBA Board of Directors on September 22, 2004. The resolution adopting the GWMP is included in the proposal.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. For example, the applicant provides a complete and detailed description of the proposed project. The applicant describes how the proposed project supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP in a clear and complete table. The proposal demonstrates collaboration between local public agencies in the water management area and describes how information gets disseminated. A long-term need and merit of the proposed project is discussed. Applicant demonstrated that new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management will be obtained as a result of the project implementation. However, explanation of how the project will be funded once grant funding is expended is not sufficiently addressed.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. For example, the Work Plan thoroughly explains what will be done in sufficient detail with the exception of Subtask 3.5 in which further detail is needed to explain how the groundwater level contour map will be generated (number of wells included, etc.). Project tasks fulfill the objectives of the proposal and are consistent with the schedule. In addition, the criterion to include a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project is not addressed in the Work Plan. Also, there is no explanation of how information gained by this proposal will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties. CEQA, environmental permitting, and access to private property are not required for the proposed project.
- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed and supported by documentation and logical rationale. However, the budget is not entirely consistent with the work plan and schedule. For example, the applicant provides the budget that seems realistic and cost effective in meeting proposal objectives. However, the budget is not entirely supported by the work plan and the schedule. The Subtask 4.5 – Establish Initial Aquifer Parameter Zones is not described in the work plan and is not included in the budget.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. For example, the applicant presents the schedule that seems realistic and is consistent with the work plan. The start date and the end date are within the PSP designated time frame. Applicant demonstrated that they will be able to proceed when funding becomes available. The anticipated start date is April 1, 2013. The duration of the project is approximately twelve month. However, the schedule does not include the reporting deliverables, such as quarterly progress reports and final report.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. For example: applicant presents a well-defined QA/QC plan that will be used in each task. QA/QC measures are incorporated in the work plan. The QA/QC plan describes how consultant will be chosen by a Consultant Selection Committee, the GBA project manager will maintain regular communication with the consultant, and regular written project reports will be required as project deliverables.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. For example: applicant demonstrated that they are capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for similar types of projects. Applicant described four projects of which two were completed and two are in progress. Applicant was able to complete the two projects within the budget and the time given in the grant agreement. Applicant attached the Resolution that adopts the IRWM Plan, Past Performance Evaluation and other documents to support their claim.